arXiv:1008.5338v1 [math.DS] 31 Aug 2010

Manuscript submitted to
AIMS' Journals
Volume **X**, Number **0X**, XX **200X**

Website: http://AIMsciences.org
pp. **X–XX**

TOPOLOGICAL PRESSURES FOR ϵ-STABLE AND STABLE SETS

Xianfeng Ma

Department of Mathematics
East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai 200237, China

Ercai Chen

School of Mathematical Science
Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210097, China
and
Center of Nonlinear Science
Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China

Abstract. Topological pressures of the preimages of ϵ-stable sets and some certain closed subsets of stable sets in positive entropy systems are investigated. It is showed that the topological pressure of any topological system can be calculated in terms of the topological pressure of the preimages of ϵ-stable sets. For the constructed closed subset of the stable set or the unstable set of any point in a measure-theoretic 'rather big' set of a topological system with positive entropy, especially for the weakly mixing subset contained in the closure of stable set and unstable set, it is proved that topological pressures of these subsets can be no less than the measure-theoretic pressure.

1. **Introduction.** Throughout this paper, by a *topological dynamical system* (X,T) (TDS for short) we mean a compact metric space X with a homeomorphism T from X to itself; the metric on X is denoted by d. For $x \in X$ and $\epsilon > 0$, the ϵ-*stable* set of x under T is the set of points whose forward orbit ϵ-shadows that of x:

$$W^s_\epsilon(x,T) = \{y \in X : d(T^n x, T^n y) \le \epsilon \text{ for all } n = 1,2,\cdots\}.$$

The preimages of these sets can be nontrivial and hence disperse at a nonzero exponent rate. The dispersal rate function $h_s(T,x,\epsilon)$ was introduced in [1]. The relationship between $h_s(T,x,\epsilon)$ and the topological entropy $h_{\text{top}}(T)$ was also investigated. It was proved that when X has finite covering dimension, then for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{x\in X} h_s(T,x,\epsilon) = h_{\text{top}}(T).$$

In [8], the finite-dimensionality hypothesis turns out to be redundant. This equality is proved to be always true for any non-invertible TDS.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 37A35, 37B40.

Key words and phrases. topological pressure, stable sets, ϵ-stable sets, weak mixing sets.

The first author is supported by the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities. The second and first authors are supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10971100). The second author is partially supported by National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program) (Grant No. 2007CB814800).

Given $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$, consider the *topological pressure of the preimages of ϵ-stable set of x*:

$$P(T,f,x,\epsilon) = \lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T,f,\delta,T^{-n}W^s_\epsilon(x,T)),$$

where

$$P_n(T,f,\delta,T^{-n}W^s_\epsilon(x,T)) = \sup\{\sum_{x\in E}\exp f_n(x) : E \text{ is an } (n,\delta)\text{-separated subset of } T^{-n}W^s_\epsilon(x,T)\},$$

and $f_n(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f\circ T^i(x)$. We show that the topological pressure of any non-invertible TDS with positive metric entropy can be calculated in terms of the topological pressure of the preimages of ϵ-stable sets. That is, for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{x\in X} P(T,f,x,\epsilon) = P(T,f),$$

where $P(T,f)$ is the standard notion of the topological pressure. Note that for the null function f, this is the above equality about the entropy.

For $x \in X$, the *stable set* $W^s(x,T)$ and the *unstable set* $W^u(x,T)$ of x are defined as

$$W^s(x,T) = \{y \in X : \lim_{n\to+\infty} d(T^n x, T^n y) = 0\},$$
$$W^u(x,T) = \{y \in X : \lim_{n\to+\infty} d(T^{-n} x, T^{-n} y) = 0\}.$$

For Anosov diffeomorphisms on a compact manifold, pairs belonging to the stable set are asymptotic under T and tend to diverge under T^{-1}. However, Blanchard *et al.* [2] showed that in most case, this phenomenon does not happen in a TDS with positive metric entropy. N. Sumi [5] investigated the stable and unstable sets of a C^2 diffeomorphism of C^∞ manifold with positive metric entropy. He showed that the closure of the stable set $W^s(x,T)$ of 'many points' is a perfect $*$-chaotic set and the closure of the unstable set $W^u(x,T)$ contains a perfect $*$-chaotic set. W. Huang [8] obtain a stronger result in the general non-invertible TDS with positive metric entropy. He proved that there exists a measure-theoretically 'rather big' set such that the closure of the stable or unstable sets of points in the set contains a weakly mixing set. The Bowen entropies of these sets were also estimated. The lower bounded is the usual metric entropy $h_\mu(T)$ for the ergodic invariant measure μ.

By introducing the topological pressure for the closed subset and using the excellent partition formed in Lemma 4 of [2], we show that for the constructed closed subsets of stable and unstable sets in [8], the topological pressure of these sets can also be estimated. More precisely, we prove that if μ is an ergodic invariant measure of a TDS (X,T) with $h_\mu(T) > 0$, then for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, the constructed closed subsets $A(x) \subseteq W^s(x,T)$, $B(x) \subseteq W^u(x,T)$ and the weakly mixing subset $E(x) \subseteq \overline{W^s(x,T)} \cap \overline{W^u(x,T)}$ in [8] satisfies that

(a). $\lim_{n\to+\infty}\operatorname{diam}(T^n A(x)) = 0$ *and* $P(T^{-1},f,A(x)) \geq P_\mu(T,f)$;
(b). $\lim_{n\to+\infty}\operatorname{diam}(T^{-n} B(x)) = 0$ *and* $P(T,f,B(x)) \geq P_\mu(T,f)$;
(c). $P(T,f,E(x)) \geq P_\mu(T,f)$ and $P(T^{-1},f,E(x)) \geq P_\mu(T,f)$,

where $P_\mu(T,f)$ is the measure theoretic pressure.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, the topological pressure for the closed subset is introduced. Some related notions and results about entropy are also listed. In Sec. 3, we introduce the notion of topological pressure of the preimages of ϵ-stable set. Using the tool formed in [2], we show that the topological pressure of any TDS can be calculated in terms of our introduced topological pressure of the preimages of ϵ-stable set. As a generalization of entropy point, the notion of the pressure point is also introduced there. In Sec. 4, we prove the above results (a)-(c). In Sec. 5, we state and prove the former results for the non-invertible case.

2. Preliminary.

Let (X,T) be a TDS and $\mathcal{B}_X$ be the σ-algebra of all Borel subsets of X. Recall that a *cover* of X is a finite family of Borel subsets of X whose union is X, and, a *partition* of X is a cover of X whose elements are pairwise disjoint. We denote the set of covers, partitions, and open covers, of X, respectively, by $\mathcal{C}_X$, $\mathcal{P}_X$, $\mathcal{C}_X^o$, respectively. Given a partition α of X and $x \in X$, denote $\alpha(x)$ the atom of α containing x. For given two covers $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, $\mathcal{U}$ is said to be *finer* than $\mathcal{V}$ (denote by $\mathcal{U} \succeq \mathcal{V}$) if each element of $\mathcal{U}$ is contained in some element of $\mathcal{V}$. Let $\mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V} = \{U \cap V : U \in \mathcal{U}, V \in \mathcal{V}\}$. Given integers M, N with $0 \leq M \leq N$ and $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, we denote $\bigvee_{n=M}^{N} T^{-n}\mathcal{U}$ by $\mathcal{U}_M^N$.

Given $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $K \subset X$, put $N(\mathcal{U}, K) = \min\{\text{the cardinality of } \mathcal{F} : \mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{U}, \bigcup_{F\in\mathcal{F}} F \supset K\}$ and $H(\mathcal{U}, K) = \log N(\mathcal{U}, K)$. Then the topological entropy of $\mathcal{U}$ with respect to T for the compact subset K is

$$h_{\text{top}}(T, \mathcal{U}, K) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K) = \inf_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{n} H(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K).$$

The topological entropy of T for the compact subset K is defined by $h_{\text{top}}(T, K) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o} h_{\text{top}}(T, \mathcal{U}, K)$; and the topological entropy of T is defined by $h_{\text{top}}(T) = \sup_K h_{\text{top}}(T, K)$.

Let (X,T) be a TDS, K be a closed subset of X, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ and $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$, where $C(X, \mathbb{R})$ be the Banach space of all continuous, real-valued functions on X endowed with the supremum norm. We denote

$$P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K) = \inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{x\in V\cap K} \exp f_n(x) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X \text{ and } \mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}\}, \tag{1}$$

where $f_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f(T^j x)$. For $V \cap K = \emptyset$, we let $f_n(x) = -\infty$ for each n. Then the above definition is well defined. It is clear that if f is the null function, then $P_n(T, 0, \mathcal{U}, K) = N(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}, K)$.

For $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, we let α be the Borel partition generated by $\mathcal{V}$ and denote

$$\mathcal{P}^*(\mathcal{V}) = \{\beta \in \mathcal{P}_X : \beta \succeq \mathcal{V} \text{ and each atom of } \beta \text{ is the union of some atoms of } \alpha\}.$$

Lemma 2.1 (Lemma 2.1 [10]). *Let M be a compact subset of X, $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$. Then*

$$\inf_{\beta\in\mathcal{C}_X, \beta\succeq\mathcal{V}} \sum_{B\in\beta} \sup_{x\in B\cap M} f(x) = \min\{\sum_{B\in\beta} \sup_{x\in B\cap M} f(x) : \beta \in \mathcal{P}^*(\mathcal{V})\}.$$

A real-valued function f defined on a compact metric space Z is called *upper semi-continuous* (for short u.s.c.) if one of the following equivalent conditions holds:

(a). $\limsup_{z'\to z} f(z') \leq f(z)$ for each $z \in Z$;
(b). for each $r \in \mathbb{R}$, the set $\{z \in Z : f(z) \geq r\}$ is closed.

By (b), the infimum of any family of u.s.c. functions is again a u.s.c. one; both the sum and supremum of finitely many u.s.c. functions are u.s.c. ones.

Lemma 2.2. *Let (X,T) be a TDS, $G : x \to \mathcal{K}(X)$ be a upper semi-continuous set-valued mapping, where $\mathcal{K}(X)$ is the collection of all nonempty closed subset of X endowed with the Hausdorff metric, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ and $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$. Then $F : x \to \inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $\mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}\}$ is a u.s.c. function.*

Proof. For each $V \in \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, let $F_V : x \to \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y)$. For each $r \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\{x_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \{x : \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y) \geq r\}$ be the sequence of points which convergence to the point x_0, we show that $x_0 \in \{x : \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y) \geq r\}$.

Given $\epsilon > 0$, since $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$d(x_1,x_2) < \delta \Rightarrow\mid f(x_1) - f(x_2) \mid< \epsilon. \tag{2}$$

The set $\{K \in \mathcal{K}(X) : H_d(G(x_0),K) < \delta\}$ is an open neighborhood of $G(x_0)$ in $\mathcal{K}(X)$, where $H_d(K_1,K_2) = \inf\{\delta > 0 :\ \text{for all}\ x_1 \in K_1, x_2 \in K_2, d(x_1,K_2) < \delta, d(x_2,K_1) < \delta\}$ is the Hausdorff metric. Since G is a upper semi-continuous set-valued mapping, then for all large enough n, $H_d(G(x_n),G(x_0)) < \delta$. From (2), we get

$$\Big| \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x_n)} f(y) - \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x_0)} f(y)\Big| \leq \epsilon.$$

By the arbitrary of ϵ, $\sup_{y\in V\cap G(x_0)} f(y) \geq r$. Then $x_0 \in \{x : \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y) \geq r\}$. That is, F_V is a upper semi-continuous function.

Since the sum of finitely many u.s.c. functions and the infimum of any family of u.s.c. functions are both u.s.c. functions, we get

$$F : x \to \inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X \text{ and } \mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}\}$$

is a u.s.c. function. □

With a similar argument of Lemma 2.2, we also have the following result.

Lemma 2.3. *Let (X,T) be a TDS, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ and $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$. Then the function $F : K \to \inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{y\in V\cap K} f(y) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $\mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}\}$ is u.s.c. from $\mathcal{K}(X)$ to $\mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{K}(X)$ is the collection of all nonempty closed subset of X endowed with the Hausdorff metric.*

Proof. It suffice to prove that for each $V \in \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, $F_V : K \to \sup_{y\in V\cap K} f(y)$ is u.s.c..

For each $r \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\{K_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \{K : \sup_{y\in V\cap K} f(y) \geq r\}$ be the sequence of subsets which convergence to the set K_0, we show that $K_0 \in \{K : \sup_{y\in V\cap K} f(y) \geq r\}$.

Given $\epsilon > 0$, since $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$d(x_1,x_2) < \delta \Rightarrow\mid f(x_1) - f(x_2) \mid< \epsilon.$$

For each $K_0 \in \mathcal{K}(X)$, the set $\{K \in \mathcal{K}(X) : H_d(K,K_0) < \delta\}$ is an open neighborhood of K in $\mathcal{K}(X)$. Then by the definition of the Hausdorff metric, it is easy to know that $\big|\sup_{y\in V\cap K} f(y) - \sup_{y\in V\cap K_0} f(y)\big| \leq \epsilon$.

By the arbitrary of ϵ, $\sup_{y\in V\cap K_0} f(y) \geq r$. Then $K_0 \in \{K : \sup_{y\in V\cap K} f(y) \geq r\}$. That is, F_V is a u.s.c. function. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let (X,T) be a TDS, K be a closed subset of X, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ and $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$. Then*

$$P(T,f,\mathcal{U},K) = \lim_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T,f,\mathcal{U},K)$$

exists.

Proof. For any $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{V}_1 \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}$, $\mathcal{V}_2 \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}$, we have $\mathcal{V}_1 \vee T^{-n}\mathcal{V}_2 \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n+m-1}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{n+m}(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K) &\leq \sum_{V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1} \sum_{V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{x \in V_1 \cap T^{-n} V_2 \cap K} \exp f_{n+m}(x) \\ &= \sum_{V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1} \sum_{V_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{x \in V_1 \cap T^{-n} V_2 \cap K} \exp(f_n(x) + f_m(T^n x)) \\ &\leq \sum_{V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1} \sum_{V_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2} \big(\sup_{x \in V_1 K} \exp f_n(x) \cdot \sup_{z \in V_2 \cap T^n K} \exp f_m(z) \big) \\ &= \big(\sum_{V_1 \in \mathcal{V}_1} \sup_{x \in V_1 \cap K} \exp f_n(x) \big) \big(\sum_{V_2 \in \mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{z \in V_2 \cap T^n K} \exp f_m(z) \big). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{V}_i, i = 1, 2$ is arbitrary, then $P_{n+m}(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K) \leq P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K) \cdot P_m(T, f, \mathcal{U}, T^n K)$, and so $\log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K)$ is subadditive. Since $P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K)$ is measurable from Lemma 2.3, then by Kingman's subadditive ergodic theorem (See [7]), we complete the proof. □

If $K = X$, then $P(T, f, \mathcal{U}, X) = P(T, f, \mathcal{U})$, which is the local topological pressure defined by Huang *et al.* [9]. Clearly, $P(T, 0, \mathcal{U}, K) = h_{\mathrm{top}}(T, \mathcal{U}, K)$.

Let (X, T) be a TDS. Denote by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ the set of all Borel, probability measures on X, $\mathcal{M}(X, T)$ the set of T-invariant measures, and $\mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ the set of ergodic measures. Then $\mathcal{M}^e(X, T) \subset \mathcal{M}(X, T) \subset \mathcal{M}(X)$, and $\mathcal{M}(X), \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ are convex, compact metric spaces endowed with the weak*-topology.

Given a partition $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}(X)$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and a sub-σ-algebra $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_\mu$, let

$$H_\mu(\alpha) = \sum_{A \in \alpha} -\mu(A) \log \mu(A) \text{ and } H_\mu(\alpha \mid \mathcal{C}) = \sum_{A \in \alpha} \int_X -\mathbb{E}(1_A \mid \mathcal{C}) \log \mathbb{E}(1_A \mid \mathcal{C}) d\mu,$$

where $\mathbb{E}(1_A \mid \mathcal{C})$ is the expectation of 1_A with respect to $\mathcal{C}$. One standard fact states that $H_\mu(\alpha \mid \mathcal{C})$ increases with respect to α and decreases with respect to $\mathcal{C}$. The measure-theoretic entropy of μ is defined as

$$h_\mu(T) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_X} h_\mu(T, \alpha),$$

where

$$h_\mu(T, \alpha) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu(\alpha_0^{n-1}) = \inf_{n \geq 1} H_\mu(\alpha_0^{n-1}).$$

For each $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$, the *measure-theoretic pressure of* μ is defined as

$$P_\mu(T, f) = h_\mu(T) + \int_X f d\mu.$$

For a given $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, set

$$H_\mu(\mathcal{U}) = \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{P}_X, \beta \succeq \mathcal{U}} H_\mu(\beta) \text{ and } H_\mu(\mathcal{U} \mid \mathcal{C}) = \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{P}_X, \beta \succeq \mathcal{U}} H_\mu(\beta \mid \mathcal{C}).$$

When $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{C}$ is T-invariant (i.e. $T^{-1}\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}$), $H_\mu(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1} \mid \mathcal{C})$ is a non-negative subadditive sequence for a given $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{U}$. Let

$$h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U} \mid \mathcal{C}) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1} \mid \mathcal{C}) = \inf_{n \geq 1} H_\mu(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1} \mid \mathcal{C}).$$

For $\mathcal{C} = \{\emptyset, X\} (\bmod\ \mu)$, we write $H_\mu(\mathcal{U} \mid \mathcal{C})$ and $h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U} \mid \mathcal{C})$ by $H_\mu(\mathcal{U})$ and $h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U})$ respectively. Romagnoli [6] proved

$$h_\mu(T) = \sup_{\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o} h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}).$$

It is well known that for $\beta \in \mathcal{P}_X$, $h_\mu(T,\beta) = h_\mu(T,\beta \mid P_\mu(T)) \leq H_\mu(\beta \mid P_\mu(T))$, where $P_\mu(T)$ is the Pinsker σ-algebra of $(X, \mathcal{B}_\mu, \mu, T)$. Huang [8] showed the following result.

Lemma 2.5 (Lemma 2.1 [8]). *Let (X,T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ and $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X$. Then*

$$h_\mu(T,\mathcal{U}) = h_\mu(T,\mathcal{U} \mid P_\mu(T)).$$

For $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ and $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$, we define the *measure-theoretic pressure for T with respect to $\mathcal{U}$* as

$$P_\mu(T,f,\mathcal{U}) = h_\mu(T,\mathcal{U}) + \int_X f d\mu.$$

Obviously,

$$P_\mu(T,f) = h_\mu(T) + \int_X f d\mu = \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o} h_\mu(T,\mathcal{U}) + \int_X f d\mu = \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o} P_\mu(T,f,\mathcal{U}).$$

Let (X,T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ be the completion of $\mathcal{B}_X$ under μ. Then $(X,\mathcal{B}_\mu,\mu,T)$ be a Lebesgue system. If $\{\alpha_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a countable family of finite partitions of X, the partition $\alpha = \bigvee_{i\in I} \alpha_i$ is called a *measurable partition*. The sets $A \in \mathcal{B}_\mu$, which are unions of atoms of α, form a sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ by $\widehat{\alpha}$ or α if there is no ambiguity. Every sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ coincides with a σ-algebra constructed in this way (mod μ).

Given a measurable partition α, put $\alpha^- = \bigvee_{n=1}^{\infty} T^{-n}\alpha$ and $\alpha^T = \bigvee_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} T^{-n}\alpha$. Define in the same way $\mathcal{F}^-$ and $\mathcal{F}^T$ if $\mathcal{F}$ is a sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$. It is clear that for a measurable partition α of X, $\widehat{\alpha^-} = (\widehat{\alpha})^-$ and $\widehat{\alpha^T} = (\widehat{\alpha})^T$ (mod μ).

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ and α be the measurable partition of X with $\alpha^- = \mathcal{F}$ (mod μ). μ can be disintegrated over $\mathcal{F}$ as $\mu = \int_X \mu_x d\mu(x)$, where $\mu_x \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and $\mu_x(\alpha(x)) = 1$ for μ-a.e. $x \in X$. The disintegration is characterized by the properties (a) and (b) below:

(a). for every $f \in L^1(X,\mathcal{B}_X,\mu)$, $f \in L^1(X,\mathcal{B}_X,\mu_x)$ for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, and the map $x \mapsto \int_X f(y) d\mu_x(y)$ is in $L^1(X,\mathcal{F},\mu)$;

(b). for every $f \in L^1(X,\mathcal{B}_X,\mu)$, $\mathbb{E}_\mu(f \mid \mathcal{F})(x) = \int_X f d\mu_x$ for μ-a.e. $x \in X$.

Then for any $f \in L^1(X,\mathcal{B}_X,\mu)$,

$$\int_X \Big(\int_X f d\mu_x\Big) d\mu(x) = \int_X f d\mu.$$

The following lemma was proved in [8].

Lemma 2.6 (Lemma 2.2 [8]). *Let (X,T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ and $\mathcal{F}$ be a sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$. If $\mu = \int_X \mu_x d\mu(x)$ is the disintegration of μ over $\mathcal{F}$, then*

(a). for $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, $H_\mu(\mathcal{V} \mid \mathcal{F}) = \int_X H_{\mu_x}(\mathcal{V}) d\mu(x)$,

(b). for $\mathcal{U}$, $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$, $H_\mu(\mathcal{U} \vee \mathcal{V} \mid \mathcal{F}) \leq H_\mu(\mathcal{U} \mid \mathcal{F}) + H_\mu(\mathcal{V} \mid \mathcal{F})$.

Let K be a non-empty closed subset of X. For $\epsilon > 0$, a subset of X is called an (n,ϵ)-*spanning set* of K, if for any $x \in K$ there exists $y \in F$ with $d_n(x,y) \leq \epsilon$, where $d_n(x,y) = \max_{i=0}^{n-1} d(T^i x, T^i y)$; a subset E of K is called an (n,ϵ)-*separated set* of K, if $x, y \in E$, $x \neq y$ implies $d_n(x,y) > \epsilon$. Let $r_n(d,T,\epsilon,K)$ denote the smallest cardinality of any (n,ϵ)-spanning subset for K and $s_n(d,T,\epsilon,K)$ denote the largest cardinality of any (n,ϵ)-separated subset of K.

For each $\epsilon > 0$ and $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$, we denote

$$P_n(T, f, \epsilon, K) = \sup\{\sum_{x\in E} \exp f_n(x) : E \text{ is an } (n, \epsilon)\text{-separated subsets of } K\}.$$

The topological pressure of T for the closed subset K is defined as

$$P(T, f, K) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \epsilon.K).$$

If f is the null function, then $P_n(T, 0, \epsilon, K) = s_n(d, T, \epsilon, K)$. It follows that $P(T, f, K) = h(T, K)$, where $h(T, K)$ is the Bowen entropy for the closed subset K defined in [7] (see also [8]). When $K = X$, $P(T, f, X) = P(T, f)$, where $P(T, f)$ is the standard notion of topological pressure defined in [7]. Moreover, it is not hard to verify that $P(T, f, K) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o} P(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K)$.

3. **ϵ-stable sets.** Let (X, T) be a TDS with a compatible metric d. Given $\epsilon > 0$, the *ϵ-stable set* of x under T is the set of points whose forward orbit ϵ-shadows that of x:

$$W_\epsilon^s(x, T) = \{y \in X : d(T^n x, T^n y) \le \epsilon \text{ for all } n = 0, 1, \cdots\}.$$

Since the preimages of these sets can be nontrivial, we can consider the following function. For each $x \in X$, $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $\epsilon > 0$, let

$$P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon) := \lim_{\delta\to 0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \delta, T^{-n}W_\epsilon^s(x, T)).$$

$P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon)$ is called the *topological pressure of the preimages of ϵ-stable set of x*. For $f \equiv 0$, $P_s(T, 0, x, \epsilon) = h_s(T, x, \epsilon)$, where the latter is the dispersal rate function defined in [1]. It was proved in [8] that $\sup_{x\in X} h_s(T, x, \epsilon) = h_{\text{top}}(T)$ for all $\epsilon > 0$. In this section, we will show that this is also true for the functions $P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon)$ and $P(T, f)$. By proving that for any $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ with positive entropy, $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon) \ge P_\mu(T, f)$ for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, we get the result. Before proving Theorem 3.6, we give several lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (X, T) be a TDS, $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$, and $\{K_n\}$ be a sequence of non-empty closed subsets of X. Then*

$$\lim_{\delta>0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \delta, K_n) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K_n).$$

Proof. For a fixed $\delta > 0$, choose $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ with $\text{diam}(\mathcal{V}) < \delta$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let A be an (n, δ)-separated set of K_n. Since $B \cap K_n$ contains at most one element of A for each B of $\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{V}$, then for every $\mathcal{W} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ with $\mathcal{W} \succeq \mathcal{V}_0^{n-1}$, each element of $\mathcal{W}$ also contains at most one element of A. We get $\sum_{x\in A} \exp f_n(x) \le P_n(T, f, \mathcal{V}, K_n)$. That is $P_n(T, f, \delta, K_n) \le P_n(T, f, \mathcal{V}, K_n)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \delta, K_n) &\le \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{V}, K_n)\\ &\le \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K_n).\end{aligned}$$

Letting $\delta \to 0$, we get

$$\lim_{\delta>0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \delta, K_n) \le \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K_n).$$

In the following, we show the converse inequality. For any fixed $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$, let δ be the Lebesgue number of $\mathcal{U}$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let E be an $(n, \frac{\delta}{2})$-separated set of K_n with the largest cardinality. Then E ia also an $(n, \frac{\delta}{2})$-spanning set of K_n. From the definition of spanning sets, we know

$$\bigcup_{x\in E} \bigcap_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\overline{B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(T^i x)} \supset K_n, \text{ where } \overline{B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(T^i x)} = \{y \in X : d(T^i x, y) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}\}.$$

Now for each $x \in E$ and $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, $\overline{B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(T^i x)}$ is contained in some element of $\mathcal{U}$ since δ is the Lebesgue number of the open cover $\mathcal{U}$. Hence for each $x \in E$, $\bigcap_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\overline{B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(T^i x)}$ is contained in some element of $\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}$. Let $\mathcal{W} = \{\bigcap_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\overline{B_{\frac{\delta}{2}}(T^i x)} : x \in E\}$, then $\mathcal{W} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $\mathcal{W} \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}$. Let

$$Q_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K_n) = \inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \inf_{x\in V\cap K_n} \exp f_n(x) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X \text{ and } \mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}\},$$

then

$$Q_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K_n) \leq \sum_{x\in E} f_n(x) \leq P_n(T, f, \frac{\delta}{2}, K_n).$$

Let $\tau_{\mathcal{U}} = \sup\{| f(x) - f(y) | : d(x, y) \leq \operatorname{diam}(\mathcal{U})\}$, then $\exp(-n\tau_{\mathcal{U}})P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K_n) \leq Q_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K_n)$. So

$$\begin{aligned} -\tau_{\mathcal{U}} + \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K_n) &\leq \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \frac{\delta}{2}, K_n) \\ &\leq \lim_{\delta\to 0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \frac{\delta}{2}, K_n). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{U}$ is arbitrary, we get

$$\sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K_n) \leq \lim_{\delta>0} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \delta, K_n).$$

□

An immediate consequence of Lemma 3.1 is the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Let (X, T) be a TDS and $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. Then for each $x \in X$ and $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon) = \sup_{\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o} \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, T^{-n}W_\epsilon^s(x, T)).$$

Lemma 3.3 (Lemma 9.9 [7])**.** *Let $a_1, \cdots, a_k$ be given real numbers. If $p_i \geq 0, i = 1, \cdots, k$, and $\sum_{i=1}^k p_i = 1$, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^k p_i(a_i - \log p_i) \leq \log(\sum_{i=1}^k e^{a_i}),$$

and equality holds iff $p_i = \frac{e^{a_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^k e^{a_i}}$ for all $i = 1, \cdots, k$.

Let (X, T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X, T)$ and $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ be the completion of $\mathcal{B}_X$ under μ. The *Pinsker σ-algebra* $P_\mu(T)$ is defined as the smallest sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ containing $\{\xi \in \mathcal{P}_X : h_\mu(T, \xi) = 0\}$. It is well known that $P_\mu(T) = P_\mu(T^{-1})$ and $P_\mu(T)$ is T-invariant, i.e. $T^{-1}(P_\mu(T)) = P_\mu(T)$. We need the following lemma proved in [8].

Lemma 3.4 (Lemma 3.5 [8])**.** *Let (X,T) be a TDS, $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$ and $\delta > 0$. Then there exist $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{P}_X$ and $0 = k_1 < k_2 < \cdots$ such that*

(a). $diam(W_1) < \delta$ and $\lim\limits_{i\to+\infty} diam(W_i) = 0$,

(b). $\lim\limits_{k\to+\infty} H_\mu(P_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) = h_\mu(T)$, where $P_k = \bigvee_{i=1}^{k} T^{-k_i} W_i$ and $\mathcal{P} = \bigvee_{k=1}^{\infty} P_k$,

(c). $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \widehat{T^{-n}\mathcal{P}^-} = P_\mu(T)$.

Lemma 3.5. *Let (X,T) be a TDS, K be a closed subset of X, $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ and $f \in C(X,(R))$. Then for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$P_n(T,f,\mathcal{U},T^{-n}K) = P_n(T, f\circ T^{-n}, T^n\mathcal{U}, K).$$

Proof. For each $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ and $\mathcal{V} \succeq \bigvee_{i=1}^{n} T^i\mathcal{U}$, obviously, $T^{-n}\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_x$ and $T^{-n}\mathcal{V} \succeq \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}$.

Since for each $V \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$\sup_{x\in T^{-n}V\cap T^{-n}K} \exp f_n(x) = \sup_{x\in V\cap K} \exp f_n(T^{-n}x),$$

it is easy to see that $P_n(T,f,\mathcal{U},T^{-n}K) \le P_n(T,f\circ T^{-n},T^n\mathcal{U},K)$. From the homeomorphism of T, the inverse inequality holds. Then $P_n(T,f,\mathcal{U},T^{-n}K) = P_n(T,f\circ T^{-n},T^n\mathcal{U},K)$. □

Now we proceed to prove the following theorem which clearly implies our main result.

Theorem 3.6. *Let (X,T) be a TDS, $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X,T)$ with $h_\mu(T) > 0$. Then for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, $\lim\limits_{\epsilon\to 0} P_s(T,f,x,\epsilon) \ge P_\mu(T,f)$.*

Proof. It suffice to prove that for a given $\epsilon > 0$, $P_s(T,f,x,\epsilon) \ge P_\mu(T,f)$ for μ-a.e. $x \in X$.

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Since T is homeomorphism on X, there exists $\delta \in (0,\epsilon)$ such that $d(T^{-1}x, T^{-1}y) < \epsilon$ when $d(x,y) < \delta$. By Lemma 3.4, there exists $\{P_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{P}_X$ satisfying that $\mathrm{diam}(P_1) \le \delta$, $\bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} \widehat{T^{-n}\mathcal{P}^-} = P_\mu(T)$ and $H_\mu(P_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) \to h_\mu(T)$ when $k \to +\infty$, where $\mathcal{P} = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\infty} P_i$. Since $\mathrm{diam}(P_1) \le \delta$, it is clear that $\mathcal{P}^-(x) \subseteq W_\epsilon^s(x,T)$ for each $x \in X$.

Let $\mu = \int_X \mu_x d\mu(x)$ be the disintegration of μ over $\mathcal{P}^-$. Then

$$\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{P}^-(x)} \subseteq W_\epsilon^s(x,T) \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } \ x \in X.$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By the inequality of (3.3) in [8], we know that there exists $\mathcal{U}_k \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\Big(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}_k \mid T^{-n}\mathcal{P}^-\Big) \ge H_\mu(P_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) - \frac{1}{k}. \tag{3}$$

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $F_n(x) = \frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T, f\circ T^{-n}, T^n\mathcal{U}_k, W_\epsilon^s(x,T))$. By Lemma 2.2, we get that F_n is u.s.c.. Moreover, it is a Borel measurable bounded function. Let $F(x) = \limsup_{n\to+\infty} F_n(x)$ for $x \in X$. Then F is Borel measurable map. Since $TW_\epsilon^s(x,T) \subseteq W_\epsilon^s(Tx,T)$ for each $x \in X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P_n(T, f\circ T^{-n}, T^n\mathcal{U}_k, W_\epsilon^s(x,T)) \\ \le & \inf\Big\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{y\in V\cap TW_\epsilon^s(x,T)} \exp f_n \circ T^{-(n+1)}(x) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X \text{ and } \ \mathcal{V} \succeq \bigvee_{i=2}^{n+1} T^i\mathcal{U}_k\Big\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\le \inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{y\in V\cap W^s_\epsilon(Tx,T)} \exp f_n\circ T^{-(n+1)}(x) : \mathcal{V}\in\mathcal{C}_X \text{ and } \mathcal{V}\succeq \bigvee_{i=1}^{n+1} T^i\mathcal{U}_k\}\\ &=P_{n+1}(T, f\circ T^{-(n+1)}, T^{n+1}\mathcal{U}_k, W^s_\epsilon(Tx,T)).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}F(x) &= \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T, f\circ T^{-n}, T^n\mathcal{U}_k, W^s_\epsilon(x,T))\\ &\le \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{n+1}{n}\cdot\frac{1}{n+1}\log P_{n+1}(T, f\circ T^{-(n+1)}, T^{n+1}\mathcal{U}_k, W^s_\epsilon(Tx,T))\\ &= F(Tx).\end{aligned}$$

That is $F(x)\le F(Tx)$ for each $x\in X$. Since $\mu\in\mathcal{M}(X,T)$, $\int_X F(Tx)d\mu(x) = \int_X F(x)d\mu(x)$, then for μ-a.e. $x\in X$, $F(Tx)=F(x)$. Moreover, $F(x)\equiv a_k$ for μ-a.e. $x\in X$ as μ is ergodic, where $a_k\ge 0$ is a constant.

From Lemma 2.1, there exists a finite partition $\beta\in\mathcal{P}^*(\bigvee_{i=1}^n T^i\mathcal{U}_k)$ such that

$$P_n(T, f\circ T^{-n}, T^n\mathcal{U}_k, W^s_\epsilon(x,T)) = \sum_{B\in\beta}\sup_{x\in B\cap W^s_\epsilon(x,T)}\exp f_n\circ T^{-n}(x).$$

It follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}&\log P_n(T, f\circ T^{-n}, T^n\mathcal{U}_k, W^s_\epsilon(x,T))\\ =&\log\sum_{B\in\beta}\sup_{x\in B\cap W^s_\epsilon(x,T)}\exp f_n\circ T^{-n}(x)\\ \ge&\sum_{B\in\beta}\mu_x(B\cap W^s_\epsilon(x,T))\big(\sup_{x\in B\cap W^s_\epsilon(x,T)}\exp f_n\circ T^{-n}(x) - \log\mu_x(B\cap W^s_\epsilon(x,T))\big)\\ =&H_{\mu_x}(\beta) + \sum_{B\in\beta}\sup_{x\in B\cap W^s_\epsilon(x,T)} f_n\circ T^{-n}(x)\cdot\mu_x(B)\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad(\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)\subseteq W^s_\epsilon(x,T) \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x\in X)\\ \ge&H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=1}^n T^i\mathcal{U}_k) + \int_X f_n\circ T^{-n}d\mu_x.\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}a_k &= \int_X F(x)d\mu = \int_X\limsup_{n\to+\infty}F_n(x)d\mu \ge \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\int_X F_n(x)d\mu\\ &\ge \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\int_X\frac{1}{n}(H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=1}^n T^i\mathcal{U}_k) + \int f_n\circ T^{-n}d\mu_x)d\mu(x)\\ &= \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\big(\int_X\frac{1}{n}H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=1}^n T^i\mathcal{U}_k)d\mu(x) + \frac{1}{n}\int_X\int f_n\circ T^{-n}d\mu_x d\mu(x)\big)\\ &= \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\big(\int_X\frac{1}{n}H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=1}^n T^i\mathcal{U}_k)d\mu(x) + \frac{1}{n}\int_X f_n\circ T^{-n}d\mu(x)\\ &= \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\int_X\frac{1}{n}H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=1}^n T^i\mathcal{U}_k)d\mu(x) + \int_X fd\mu(x) \text{ (since} \mu\in\mathcal{M}(X,T))\\ &= \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=1}^n T^i\mathcal{U}_k\mid\mathcal{P}^-) + \int_X fd\mu(x) \text{ (by Lemma 2.6(}a))\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\Big(\bigvee_{i=1}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}_k \mid T^{-n}\mathcal{P}^-\Big) + \int_X f d\mu(x) \\
&\geq H_\mu(P_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) - \frac{1}{k} + \int_X f d\mu(x) \text{ (by the inequality (3)).}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon) \geq F(x)$ for each $x \in X$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon) &\geq \lim_{k\to+\infty} \big(H_\mu(P_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) - \frac{1}{k} + \int_X f d\mu(x)\big) \\
&= h_\mu(T) + \int_X f d\mu(x) = P_\mu(T, f)
\end{aligned}
$$

for μ-a.e. $x \in X$. □

We introduce the ϵ-pressure point and pressure point for a TDS. Let (X, T) be a TDS, $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. For $\epsilon > 0$, we call $x \in X$ an *ϵ-pressure point* for T if $P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon) = P(T, f)$; and *pressure point* if $\lim_{\epsilon\to o} P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon) = P(T, f)$. The function $P_s(T, f, x, \epsilon)$ is decreasing in ϵ. It follows that every pressure point is also an ϵ-pressure point for each $\epsilon > 0$. Note that while the notion of ϵ-pressure point depends on the choice of the metric, that of pressure point does not. Denote by $\mathscr{P}(T, f)$ the set of all pressure point of (X, T) for $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. For $f \equiv 0$, the ϵ-pressure point and pressure point are the ϵ-entropy point and entropy point, respectively, which are introduced in [1]. Moreover, $\mathscr{P}(T, 0) = \mathcal{E}(T)$, where $\mathcal{E}$ is the set of all entropy points of (X, T).

Remark 1. Let (X, T) be a TDS, $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$. If there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ such that $P(T, f) = P_\mu(T, f)$, then $\mathscr{P}(T, f) \neq \emptyset$.

4. **Stable sets.**

The main results of this section is Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 4.4. Recall that for a TDS (X, T) and $x \in X$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
W^s(x, T) &= \{y \in X : \lim_{n\to+\infty} d(T^n x, T^n y) = 0\} \text{ and} \\
W^u(x, T) &= \{y \in X : \lim_{n\to+\infty} d(T^{-n} x, T^{-n} y) = 0\}
\end{aligned}
$$

$W^s(x, T)$ is called the *stable set* of x for T, and $W^u(x, T)$ is called the *unstable set* of x for T. Obviously, $W^s(x, T) = W^u(x, T^{-1})$ and $W^u(x, T) = W^s(x, T^{-1})$. To show Theorem 4.2, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $G : X \to \mathcal{K}(X)$ be a set-valued measurable map, where $\mathcal{K}(X)$ is the family of all closed subset of X endowed with the Hausdorff metric, $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$. Then*

$$
F : x \to \inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X \text{ and } \mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}\}
$$

is a Borel measurable map.

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$
\inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X \text{ and } \mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}\} = \min \sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y) : \mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{P}^*(\mathcal{U})\}.
$$

It is sufficient to prove that for each $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{P}^*(\mathcal{U})$, the function $H : x \to \sup_{y\in V\cap G(x)} f(y)$ is measurable .

Since $G : X \to \mathcal{K}(X)$ is a set-valued measurable map, by the well-known Castaing representation theorem, there exists a countable family $\{\sigma_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ of measurable selections of G such that $G(x) = \overline{\{\sigma_n(x) : n \in \mathbb{N}\}}$ for each $x \in X$. Then G admits a subsequence $\{\sigma_{n_i} : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that $\overline{V} \cap G(x) = \overline{\{\sigma_{n_i}(x) : i \in \mathbb{N}\}}$. It follows that $H(x) = \sup_{n \geq 1} f(\sigma_n(x))$ is a Borel measurable function. Then F is a Borel measurable map. $\square$

Theorem 4.2. *Let (X, T) be a TDS, $f \in C(X, \mathbb{R})$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ with $h_\mu(T) > 0$. Then for μ-a.e. $x \in X$,*

(a). there exists a closed subset $A(x) \subseteq W^s(x, T)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} diam(T^n A(x)) = 0 \text{ and } P(T^{-1}, f, A(x)) \geq P_\mu(T, f);$$

(b). there exists a closed subset $B(x) \subseteq W^u(x, T)$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} diam(T^{-n} B(x)) = 0 \text{ and } P(T, f, B(x)) \geq P_\mu(T, f).$$

Proof. Since $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$, $P_\mu(T^{-1}, f) = P_\mu(T, f)$ and $W^s(x, T^{-1}) = W^u(x, T)$, (a) implies (b). It remains to prove (a).

By Lemma 3.4, there exist $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{P}_X$ and $0 = k_1 < k_2 < \cdots$ satisfying that

(a). $\mathrm{diam}(W_1) < \delta$ and $\lim_{i\to+\infty} \mathrm{diam}(W_i) = 0$,

(b). $\lim_{k\to+\infty} H_\mu(P_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) = h_\mu(T)$, where $P_k = \bigvee_{i=1}^k T^{-k_i} W_i$ and $\mathcal{P} = \bigvee_{k=1}^\infty P_k$,

(c). $\bigcap_{n=0}^\infty \widehat{T^{-n}\mathcal{P}^-} = P_\mu(T)$.

Let $Q_i = \bigvee_{j=1}^i T^{-j}(P_1 \vee P_2 \vee \cdots P_i)$ for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $Q_i \in \mathcal{P}_X$, $Q_1 \preceq Q_2 \preceq \cdots$ and $\bigvee_{i=1}^\infty Q_i = \mathcal{P}^-$.

For $x \in X$, let $A(x) = \bigcap_{i=1}^\infty \overline{Q_i(x)}$. Then $A(x)$ is a closed set and $A(x) \supseteq \overline{\mathcal{P}^-(x)}$. The set $A(x)$ also satisfies that $\lim_{n\to+\infty} \mathrm{diam}(T^n A(x)) = 0$ and $A(x) \subseteq W^s(x, T)$ (see the proof of Theorem 4.2 [8] for details).

Moreover, the set-valued map $A : x \to A(x)$ is measurable. In fact, for each open set U of X,

$$\{x : \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \overline{Q_i(x)} \subseteq U\} = \bigcup_{n\geq 1} \bigcap_{k \geq n} \bigcap \{A \in Q_k : \overline{A} \subseteq U\}$$

is a Borel set of X. Then for each closed set V of X, $\{x : \overline{Q_i(x)} \subseteq X \backslash V\}$ is a Borel set. It follows that $\{x : \overline{Q_i(x)} \cap V \neq \emptyset\}$ is Borel and then $A : x \to A(x)$ is set-valued measurable.

Let $\mu = \int_X \mu_x d\mu(x)$ be the disintegration of μ over $\mathcal{P}^-$. Then

$$\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{P}^-(x)} \subseteq A(x) \text{ for } \mu\text{-a.e. } x \in X. \tag{4}$$

We now prove that for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, $P(T^{-1}, f, A(x)) \geq P_\mu(T, f)$. Since $\lim_{k\to+\infty} H_\mu(P_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) = h_\mu(T)$, it is sufficient to prove that for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $P(T^{-1}, f, A(x)) \geq H_\mu(P_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) - \frac{1}{k} + \int_X f d\mu(x)$ for μ-a.e. $x \in X$.

For a given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $\mathcal{U}_k \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ such that

$$\limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu\big(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}_k \mid T^{-n}\mathcal{P}^-\big) \geq H_\mu(P_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) - \frac{1}{k} \text{ for each } n \in \mathbb{N} \tag{5}$$

(see [8] for details).

Let $F_n(x) = \frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T^{-1}, f, \mathcal{U}_k, A(x))$, where

$$P_n(T^{-1}, f, \mathcal{U}_k, A(x)) = \inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{y\in V\cap A(x)} \exp f_n \circ T^{(n-1)}(y) :$$
$$\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X \text{ and } \mathcal{V} \succeq \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^i\mathcal{U}_k\}.$$

By the above Lemma 4.1, F_n is a Borel measurable function. Let $F_n(x) = \limsup\limits_{n\to+\infty} F_n(x)$ for each $x \in X$. Then F is also a Borel measurable function on X.

For each $\mathcal{V} \succeq \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^i\mathcal{U}_k$, $T^{-1}\mathcal{V} \succeq \bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^i\mathcal{U}_k$. Since $T(A(x)) \subseteq A(T(x))$ (see the proof of Theorem 4.2 [8]), for each $V \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{y\in T^{-1}V\cap A(x)} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^{-i}y) &\le \sup_{y\in T^{-1}(V\cap A(Tx))} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f(T^{-i}y)\\ &= \sup_{y\in V\cap A(Tx)} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(T^{-i}y) \le \sup_{y\in V\cap A(Tx)} \sum_{i=0}^{n} f(T^{-i}y),\end{aligned}$$

then it is not hard to see that

$$P_n(T^{-1}, f, \mathcal{U}_k, A(x)) \le P_{n+1}(T^{-1}, f, \mathcal{U}_k, A(Tx)).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}F(x) &= \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{1}{n} \log P_n(T^{-1}, f, \mathcal{U}_k, A(x))\\ &\le \limsup_{n\to+\infty} \frac{n+1}{n}\cdot\frac{1}{n+1}\log P_n(T^{-1}, f, \mathcal{U}_k, A(Tx))\\ &= F(Tx).\end{aligned}$$

That is $F(x) \le F(Tx)$ for each $x \in X$. Since $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(X,T)$, $\int_X (f(Tx) - f(x))d\mu(x) = 0$, then $F(Tx) = F(x)$ for μ-a.e. $x \in X$. From the ergodicity of μ, there exists a constant $a_k \ge 0$ such that $F(x) \equiv a_k$ for μ-a.e. $x \in X$.

By Lemma 2.1, there exists a partition $\beta \in \mathcal{P}^*(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^i\mathcal{U}_k)$ such that for μ-a.e. $x \in X$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\log P_n(T^{-1}, f, \mathcal{U}_k, A(x))\\ &= \log \sum_{B\in\beta} \sup_{y\in B\cap A(x)} \exp \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f^{-i}(y)\\ &\ge \sum_{B\in\beta} \mu_x(B)(\sup_{y\in B\cap A(x)} \exp \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f^{-i}(y) - \log\mu_x(B))\\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \text{(by (4) and Lemma 3.3)}\\ &= H_{\mu_x}(\beta) + \sum_{B\in\beta} \sup_{y\in B\cap A(x)} \exp \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f^{-i}(y)\cdot\mu_x(B)\\ &\ge H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^i\mathcal{U}_k) + \int_X f_n\circ T^{-(n-1)} d\mu_X\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
a_k &= \int_X F(x)d\mu \\
&= \int_X \limsup_{n\to+\infty} F_n(x)d\mu(x) \geq \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\int_X F_n(x)d\mu(x) \\
&\geq \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\int_X \big(H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1}T^i\mathcal{U}_k) + \int_X f_n\circ T^{-(n-1)}d\mu_x\big)d\mu(x) \\
&= \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\big(\int_X H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1}T^i\mathcal{U}_k)d\mu(x) + \int_X f_n\circ T^{-(n-1)}d\mu(x)\big) \\
&= \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\int_X H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1}T^i\mathcal{U}_k)d\mu(x) + \int_X fd\mu(x) \text{ (since } \mu\in\mathcal{M}(X,T)) \\
&= \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1}T^i\mathcal{U}_k \mid \mathcal{P}^-) + \int_X fd\mu(x) \text{ (by Lemma 2.6 } (a)) \\
&= \limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}H_\mu(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1}T^i\mathcal{U}_k \mid T^{-(n-1)}\mathcal{P}^-) + \int_X fd\mu(x) \\
&\geq H_\mu(P_k\mid\mathcal{P}^-) - \frac{1}{k} + \int_X fd\mu(x) \text{ (by (5))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for μ-a.e. $x\in X$,

$$P(T^{-1},f,A(x)) \geq P(T^{-1},f,\mathcal{U}_k,A(x)) = F(x) \geq H_\mu(P_k\mid\mathcal{P}^-) - \frac{1}{k} + \int_X fd\mu(x)$$

for each $k\in\mathbb{N}$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
P(T^{-1},f,A(x)) &\geq \lim_{n\to+\infty}(H_\mu(P_k\mid\mathcal{P}^-)-\frac{1}{k}) + \int_X fd\mu(x) \\
&= H_\mu(T) + \int_X fd\mu(x) = P_\mu(T,f).
\end{aligned}$$

We complete the proof of Theorem 4.2. □

A direct consequence of Theorem 4.2 is the following.

Corollary 1. *Let (X,T) be a TDS, $f\in C(X,\mathbb{R})$. If there exists $\mu\in\mathcal{M}^e(X,T)$ with $P_\mu(T,f)=P(T,f)$, then there exists $x\in X$, a closed subset $A(x)\subseteq W^s(x,T)$ and a closed subset $B(x)\subseteq W^u(x,T)$ such that*

(a). $\lim_{n\to+\infty} diam(T^nA(x))=0$ *and* $P(T^{-1},f,A(x))=P(T,f)$*;*

(b). $\lim_{n\to+\infty} diam(T^{-n}B(x))=0$ *and* $P(T,f,B(x))=P(T,f)$*.*

A TDS (X,T) is transitive if for each pair of non-empty open subsets U and V of X, there exists $n\geq 0$ such that $U\cap T^{-n}V\neq\emptyset$; and it is weakly mixing, if $(X\times X, T\times T)$ is transitive. These notions describe the global properties of the whole TDS. Blanchard *et al.* [3] give a new criterion to picture ‘a certain amount of weakly mixing’ in some consistent sense. The notion of the weakly mixing set was introduced as follows.

If X, Y are topological spaces, denote by $\mathcal{C}(X,Y)$ the set of all continuous maps from X to Y.

Definition 4.3. Let (X,T) be a TDS and $A\in 2^X$. The set A is said to be weakly mixing for T if there exists $B\subset A$ satisfying

(a). B is the union of countably many Cantor sets;
(b). the closure of B equals A;
(c). for any $C\in B$ and $g\in \mathcal{C}(C,A)$ there exists an increasing sequence of natural numbers $\{n_i\}\subset \mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim_{i\to+\infty}T^{n_i}x=g(x)$ for any $x\in C$.

Denote by $WM_s(X,T)$ the family of weakly mixing subsets of (X,T). The system (X,T) itself is called partially mixing if when it contains a weakly mixing set. The whole space X is a weakly mixing set if and only if TDS (X,T) is weakly mixing [4]. The following result (See Prop. 4.2 [3]) give an equivalent characterization of the weakly mixing set in another way.

Proposition 1. *Let (X,T) be a TDS and A be a non-singleton closed subset of X. Then A is a weakly mixing subset of X if and only if for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$, any choice of non-empty open subsets $V_1,\cdots,V_k$ of A and non-empty open subsets $U_1,\cdots,U_k$ of X with $A\cap U_i\neq\emptyset$, $i=1,2,\cdots,k$, there exists $m\in\mathbb{N}$ such that $T^mV_i\cap U_i\neq\emptyset$ for each $1\le i\le k$.*

Now we prove the following theorem. The first part (a) of Theorem 4.4 was already proved in [8]. For completeness, we state it in the theorem.

Theorem 4.4. *Let (X,T) be a TDS and $\mu\in\mathcal{M}^e(X,T)$ with $h_\mu(T)>0$. Then for μ-a.e. $x\in X$, there exists a closed subset $E(x)\subseteq\overline{W^s(x,T)}\cap\overline{W^u(x,T)}$ such that*

(a). $E(x)\in WM_s(X,T)\cap WM_s(X,T^{-1})$, i.e., $E(x)$ is weakly mixing for T, T^{-1}.
(b). $P(T,f,E(x))\ge P_\mu(T,f)$ and $P(T^{-1},f,E(x))\ge P_\mu(T,f)$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{B}_\mu$ be the completion of $\mathcal{B}_X$ under μ. Then $(X,\mathcal{B}_\mu,\mu,T)$ is a Lebesgue system. Let $P_\mu(T)$ be the Pinsker σ-algebra of $(X,\mathcal{B}_\mu,\mu,T)$. Let $\mu=\int_X\mu_x d\mu(x)$ be the disintegration μ over $P_\mu(T)$. Then for μ-a.e. $x\in X$, $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)\subseteq\overline{W^s(x,T)}\cap\overline{W^u(x,T)}$ and $\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)\in WM_s(X,T)\cap WM_s(X,T^{-1})$(See Theorem 4.6 in [8] for details).

We now prove that for μ-a.e. $x\in X$, $P(T,f,\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x))\ge P_\mu(T,f)$ and $P(T^{-1},f,\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x))\ge P_\mu(T,f)$. By the symmetry of T and T^{-1}, $P_\mu(T,f)=P_\mu(T^{-1},f)$. It remains to prove that for μ-a.e. $x\in X$, $P(T,f,\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x))\ge P_\mu(T,f)$. Since $P_\mu(T)$ is T-invariant, $T\mu_x=\mu_{Tx}$ for μ-a.e. $x\in X$, therefore, there exists a T-invariant measurable set $X_0\subset X$ with $\mu(X_0)=1$ and $T\mu_x=\mu_{Tx}$ for $x\in X_0$.

For each $\mathcal{U}\in\mathcal{C}_X^o$, $x\in X_0$ and $n\in\mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 2.1, there exists a $\beta\in\mathcal{P}^*(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\log P_n(T,f,\mathcal{U},\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x))\\
&=\log\inf\{\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}}\sup_{y\in V\cap\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)}\exp f_n(x):\mathcal{V}\in\mathcal{C}_X \text{ and } \mathcal{V}\succeq\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}\}\\
&=\log\sum_{B\in\beta}\sup_{y\in B\cap\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)}\exp f_n(x)\\
&\ge\sum_{B\in\beta}\mu_x(B)\big(\sup_{y\in B\cap\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)}f_n(x)-\log\mu_x(B)\big)\quad\text{(by Lemma 3.3)}\\
&=H_{\mu_x}(\beta)+\sum_{B\in\beta}\mu_x(B)\cdot\sup_{y\in B\cap\mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)}f_n(x)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\geq H_{\mu_x}(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}) + \int_X f_n d\mu_x \tag{6}$$

Fix $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, denote $F_n(x) = H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}) + \int_X f_n d\mu_x$ for each $x \in X_0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{n+m}(x) &= H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n+m-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}) + \int_X f_{n+m} d\mu_x \\
&\leq H_{\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{n-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}) + H_{\mu_x}(T^{-n}\bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}) + \int_X f_n d\mu_x + \int_X f_m \circ T^n d\mu_x \\
&\leq F_n(x) + H_{T^n\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}) + \int_X f_m \circ T^n d\mu_x \\
&= F_n(x) + H_{T^n\mu_x}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}) + \int_X f_m dT^n\mu_x \\
&= F_n(x) + H_{\mu_{T^n x}}(\bigvee_{i=0}^{m-1} T^{-i}\mathcal{U}) + \int_X f_m d\mu_{T^n x} \\
&= F_n(x) + F_m(T^n x)
\end{aligned}$$

That is, $\{F_n\}$ is subadditive. Since the map $x \to \mu_x(A)$ for each $A \in \mathcal{B}$ is measurable on X_0, it follows that $F_n(x)$ is measurable on X_0. By Kingman sub-additive ergodic theorem, $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} F_n(x) \equiv a_{\mathcal{U}}$ for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, where $a_{\mathcal{U}}$ is a constant. Then by (6), $P(T, f, \mathcal{U}, \mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)) \geq a_{\mathcal{U}}$ for each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^0$ and μ-a.e. $x \in X$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{\mathcal{U}} &= \int_X \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} F_n(x) d\mu \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_X F_n(x) d\mu \quad \text{(by Kingman sub-additive ergodic theorem)} \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \int_X \big(H_{\mu_x}(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}) + \int_X f_n d\mu_x\big) d\mu(x) \\
&= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} H_\mu(\mathcal{U}_0^{n-1} \mid P_\mu(T)) + \int_X f d\mu \\
&= h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U} \mid P_\mu(T)) + \int_X f d\mu \\
&= P_\mu(T, f, \mathcal{U}) \quad \text{(by Lemma 2.5)}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $P(T, f, \mathcal{U}, \mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)) \geq P_\mu(T, f, \mathcal{U})$ for each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ and μ-a.e. $x \in X$.

Choose a sequence of open cover $\{\mathcal{U}_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ with $\lim \mathrm{diam}\{\mathcal{U}_m\} = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{n\to\infty} P_\mu(T, f, \mathcal{U}_m) &= \lim_{n\to\infty} (h_\mu(T, \mathcal{U}_m) + \int_X f d\mu) \\
&= h_\mu(T) + \int_X f d\mu = P_\mu(T, f).
\end{aligned}$$

Since for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and μ-a.e. $x \in X$, $P(T, f, \mathcal{U}_m, \mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)) \geq P_\mu(T, f, \mathcal{U}_m)$, we have

$$P(T, f, \mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)) = \sup_{m\in\mathbb{N}} P(T, f, \mathcal{U}_m, \mathrm{supp}(\mu_x)) \geq \sup_{m\geq 1} P_\mu(T, f, \mathcal{U}_m) = P_\mu(T, f)$$

for each μ-a.e. $x \in X$. $\square$

It is not hard to see that the following corollary holds.

Corollary 2. *Let* (X,T) *be a TDS and* $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$. *Then*

(a). $\sup_{x\in X} P(T, f, \overline{W^s(x,T)} \cap \overline{W^u(x,T)}) = P(T,f)$;

(b). If there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X,T)$ *with* $P_\mu(T,f) = P(T,f)$, *then for* μ*-a.e.* $x \in X$, *there exists a closed subsets* $E(x) \subseteq \overline{W^s(x,T)} \cap \overline{W^u(x,T)}$ *such that*

  (a) $E(x) \in WM_s(X,T) \cap WM_s(X,T^{-1})$ *and*

  (b) $P(T,f,E(x)) = P(T^{-1},f,E(x)) = P(T,f)$.

5. **Non-invertible case.** In this section, we will generalize the results in Sects. 3 and 4 to the non-invertible case. Let (X,T) be a non-invertible TDS, i.e., X is a compact metric space, and $T : X \to X$ is a surjective continuous map but not one-to-one.

Let d be the metric on X and define $\widetilde{X} = \{(x_1,x_2,\cdots) : T(x_{i+1}) = x_i, x_i \in X, i \in \mathbb{N}\}$. It is clear that $\widetilde{X}$ is a subspace of the product space $\Pi_{i=1}^{\infty} X$ with the metric d_T defined by

$$d_T((x_1,x_2,\cdots),(y_1,y_2,\cdots)) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{d(x_i,y_i)}{2^i}.$$

Let $\widetilde{T} : \widetilde{X} \to \widetilde{X}$ be the shift homeomorphism, i.e., $\widetilde{T}(x_1,x_2,\cdots) = (T(x_1),x_1,x_2,\cdots)$. We refer the TDS $(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{T})$ as the inverse limit of (X,T). Let $\pi_i : \widetilde{X} \to X$ be the natural projection onto the i^{th} coordinate. Then $\pi_i : (\widetilde{X},\widetilde{T}) \to (X,T)$ is a factor map.

We need the following lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. *Let* (X,T) *be a non-invertible TDS,* $f \in C(X,\mathbb{N})$. *Then for each* $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ *and each compact subset* K *of* X,

$$P_{n+m}(T,f,\mathcal{U},K) \le P_m(T,f,\mathcal{U},K) \cdot P_n(T, f \circ T^m, T^{-m}\mathcal{U}, K)$$

for each $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Since for each $\mathcal{V}_1 \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{m-1}$, $\mathcal{V}_2 \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}$, then $\mathcal{V}_1 \vee T^{-m}\mathcal{V}_2 \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n+m-1}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{n+m}(T,f,\mathcal{U},K) &\le \sum_{V_1\in\mathcal{V}_1}\sum_{V_2\in\mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{x\in V_1\cap T^{-m}V_2\cap K} \exp f_{n+m}(x) \\ &= \sum_{V_1\in\mathcal{V}_1}\sum_{V_2\in\mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{x\in V_1\cap T^{-m}V_2\cap K} \exp(f_m(x) + f_n(T^m x)) \\ &\le \sum_{V_1\in\mathcal{V}_1}\sum_{V_2\in\mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{x\in V_1\cap K} \exp f_m(x) \cdot \sup_{x\in T^{-m}V_2\cap K} \exp f_n(T^m x) \\ &= \sum_{V_1\in\mathcal{V}_1} \sup_{x\in V_1\cap K} \exp f_m(x) \cdot \sum_{V_2\in\mathcal{V}_2} \sup_{x\in T^{-m}V_2\cap K} \exp(f\circ T^m)_n(x). \end{aligned}$$

By the arbitrary of $\mathcal{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{V}_2$, we have

$$P_{n+m}(T,f,\mathcal{U},K) \le P_m(T,f,\mathcal{U},K) \cdot P_n(T, f\circ T^m, T^{-m}\mathcal{U}, K).$$

$\square$

Lemma 5.2. *Let (X,T) be a non-invertible TDS, $f \in C(X,\mathbb{N})$. Then for each $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ and each compact subset K of X,*

$$P_n(T, f\circ T^m, T^{-m}\mathcal{U}, T^{-m}K) = P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K) \text{ for each } n, m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. Fix $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $\mathcal{V} \succeq (T^{-m}\mathcal{U})_0^{n-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{x\in V\cap T^{-m}K} \exp(f\circ T^m)_n(x) \\ =&\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{x\in V\cap T^{-m}K} \exp f_n(T^m x) \\ =&\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{x\in T^m V\cap K} \exp f_n(x). \end{aligned}$$

Since $T^m\mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}$, then

$$P_n(T, f\circ T^m, T^{-m}\mathcal{U}, T^{-m}K) \le P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K).$$

Conversely, for each $\mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}$, $T^{-m}\mathcal{V} \succeq (T^{-m}\mathcal{U})_0^{n-1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{x\in V\cap K} \exp f_n(x) \\ =&\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{x\in T^{-m}(V\cap K)} \exp f_n(T^m x) \\ =&\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{x\in T^{-m}V\cap T^{-m}K} \exp(f\circ T^m)_n(x). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$P_n(T, f\circ T^m, T^{-m}\mathcal{U}, T^{-m}K) \ge P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, K),$$

and we complete the proof. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let $(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{T})$ be the inverse limit of a non-invertible TDS (X,T), $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$ and $\pi_1 : \widetilde{X} \to X$ be the projection to the 1^{th} coordinate. Then for any sequence non-empty closed subsets K_n of $\widetilde{X}$,*

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(\widetilde{T}, f\circ\pi_1, \delta, K_n) = \lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T, f, \delta, \pi_1(K_n)).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$. For each $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}_X$ with $\mathcal{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}$ and $x \in V\cap\pi_1(K_n)$, obviously,$\pi_1^{-1}\mathcal{V} \succeq (\pi_i^{-1}\mathcal{U})_0^{n-1}$ and

$$(f\circ\pi_1)_n(\widetilde{x}) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(f\circ\pi_1)(\widetilde{T}^j(\widetilde{x})) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} f\circ T^j(\pi_1\widetilde{x}) = f_n(\pi_1\widetilde{x}) = f_n(x),$$

where $x = \pi_1\widetilde{x}$. Then

$$\sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{\widetilde{x}\in\pi_1^{-1}V\cap K_n} \exp(f\circ\pi_1)_n(\widetilde{x}) = \sum_{V\in\mathcal{V}} \sup_{x\in V\cap\pi_1(K_n)} \exp f_n(x).$$

It follows that

$$P_n(\widetilde{T}, f\circ\pi_1, \pi_1^{-1}\mathcal{U}, K_n) \le P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_1(K_n)). \tag{7}$$

On the other hand, for each $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}} \in \mathcal{C}_X^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\widetilde{\mathcal{V}} \succeq (\pi_1^{-1}\mathcal{U})_0^{n-1}$ and $\widetilde{x} \in \widetilde{V} \cap K_n$, $\pi_1\widetilde{V} \succeq \mathcal{U}_0^{n-1}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\widetilde{V}\in\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}} \sup_{\widetilde{x}\in\widetilde{V}\cap K_n} \exp(f\circ\pi_1)_n(\widetilde{x}) &= \sum_{\widetilde{V}\in\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}} \sup_{x\in\pi_1(\widetilde{V}\cap K_n)} \exp f_n(x)\\ &= \sum_{V\in\pi_1\widetilde{V}} \sup_{x\in\pi_1\widetilde{V}\cap\pi_1 K_n} \exp f_n(x),\end{aligned}$$

where $x = \pi_1\widetilde{x}$. Then we get the opposite part of the inequality of (7), and consequently

$$P_n(\widetilde{T}, f\circ\pi_1, \pi_1^{-1}\mathcal{U}, K_n) = P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_i(K_n)). \tag{8}$$

Now we have

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(\widetilde{T}, f\circ\pi_1, \pi_1^{-1}\mathcal{U}, K_n) = \limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_1(K_n)).$$

From Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(\widetilde{T}, f\circ\pi_1, \delta, K_n) \geq \lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T, f, \delta, \pi_1(K_n)).$$

Conversely, let $\pi_i : \widetilde{X} \to X$ be the projection to the i$^{\text{th}}$ coordinate and $\widetilde{\mathcal{U}} \in \mathcal{C}^o_{\widetilde{X}}$. By the definition of $\widetilde{X}$, it is easy to see that there exists some $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{C}_X^o$ such that $\pi_i^{-1}(\mathcal{U}) \succeq \widetilde{U}$. Since for any two closed subsets C and D of X, $P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, C) \leq P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, D)$, and $\pi_i(K_n) \succeq T^{-(i-1)}\pi_i(K_n)$, then by (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(\widetilde{T}, f\circ\pi_1, \widetilde{\mathcal{U}}, K_n)\\ \leq&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(\widetilde{T}, f\circ\pi_1, \pi_i^{-1}\mathcal{U}, K_n)\\ =&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_i(K_n))\\ \leq&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, T^{-(i-1)}\pi_i(K_n))\\ =&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n+i-1}\log P_{n+i-1}(T, f, \mathcal{U}, T^{-(i-1)}\pi_i(K_n))\\ \leq&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n+i-1}\log\big(P_{i-1}(T, f, \mathcal{U}, T^{-(i-1)}\pi_i(K_n))\\ &\qquad\cdot P_n(T, f\circ T^{i-1}, T^{-(i-1)}\mathcal{U}, T^{-(i-1)}\pi_i(K_n))\big)\quad\text{(by Lemma 5.1)}\\ =&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}P_n(T, f, \mathcal{U}, \pi_1(K_n))\qquad\text{(by Lemma 5.2)}\\ \leq&\lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}P_n(T, f, \delta, \pi_1(K_n)).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(\widetilde{T}, f\circ\pi_1, \delta, K_n) \leq \lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T, f, \delta, \pi_1(K_n)).$$

□

Now we can prove the following theorem.

Theorem 5.4. *Let (X,T) be a non-invertible TDS, $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X,T)$ with $h_\mu(T) > 0$. Then for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} P_s(T,f,x,\epsilon) \geq P_\mu(T,f)$.*

Proof. Let $(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{T})$ be the inverse limit of (X,T). For $\epsilon > 0$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\widetilde{x} \in \widetilde{X}$,denote $K_n = \widetilde{T}^{-n} W^s_{\frac{\epsilon}{2}}(\widetilde{x},\widetilde{T})$. Then from the definition of d_T and $\widetilde{X}$, it is easy to see that $\pi_1(K_n) \subseteq T^{-n} W^s_\epsilon(x,T)$, where $x = \pi_1(\widetilde{x})$. By Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_s(T,f,x,\epsilon) &= \lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log P_n(T,f,\delta,T^{-n}W^s_\epsilon(x,T)) \\ &\geq \lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\log P_n(T,f,\delta,\pi_1(K_n)) \\ &= \lim_{\delta\to 0}\limsup_{n\to+\infty}\log P_n(\widetilde{T},f\circ\pi_1,\delta,K_n) \\ &= P_s(\widetilde{T},f\circ\pi_1,\widetilde{x},\frac{\epsilon}{2}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for each $\widetilde{x} \in \widetilde{X}$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} P_s(T,f,\pi_1(\widetilde{x}),\epsilon) \geq \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} P_s(\widetilde{T},f\circ\pi_1,\widetilde{x},\frac{\epsilon}{2}). \tag{9}$$

Let $\widetilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^e(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{T})$ with $\pi_1(\widetilde{\mu}) = \mu$. Then by Theorem 3.6, there exists a Borel subset $\widetilde{X_0} \subseteq \widetilde{X}$ with $\widetilde{\mu}(\widetilde{X_0}) = 1$ such that for any $\widetilde{x} \in \widetilde{X_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} P_s(\widetilde{T},f\circ\pi_1,\widetilde{x},\frac{\epsilon}{2}) \geq P_{\widetilde{\mu}}(\widetilde{T},f\circ\pi_1) &= h_{\widetilde{\mu}}(\widetilde{T}) + \int_{\widetilde{X}} f\circ\pi_1 d\widetilde{\mu} \\ &\geq h_\mu(T) + \int_X f d\mu = P_\mu(T,f). \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Let $X_0 = \pi_1(\widetilde{X_0})$. Then $X_0 \in \mathcal{B}_\mu$ and $\mu(X_0) = 1$. By the inequality (9) and (10), we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} P_s(T,f,x,\epsilon) \geq P_\mu(T,f) \quad \text{for each } x \in X_0,$$

and we complete the proof. □

Theorem 5.4 immediately lead to the following corollary.

Corollary 3. *Let (X,T) be a non-invertible TDS and $f \in C(X,\mathbb{R})$. If there exists a $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X,T)$ such that $P_\mu(T,f) = P(T,f)$, then $\mathcal{P}(T,f) \neq \emptyset$.*

Lemma 5.5. *Let $(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{T})$ be the inverse limit of a non-invertible TDS (X,T). If $A \subseteq \widetilde{E}$ is weak mixing, so is $\pi_1(A)$ and $P(\widetilde{T},f\circ\pi_1,A) = P(T,f,\pi_1(A))$.*

Proof. The fact that $\pi_1(A)$ is weak mixing follows from Lemma 4.8 in [3]. The latter follows from Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 3.1. □

The following theorem shows that Theorem 4.4 also holds for non-invertible TDS.

Theorem 5.6. *Let (X,T) be a non-invertible TDS and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X,T)$ with $h_\mu(T) > 0$. Then for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, there exists a closed subset $E(x) \subseteq \overline{W^s(x,T)}$ such that $P(T,f,E(x)) \geq P_\mu(T,f)$ and $E(x) \in WM_s(X,T)$.*

Proof. Let $(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{T})$ be the inverse limit of (X,T). Then there exists $\widetilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{M}^e(\widetilde{X},\widetilde{T})$ with $\pi_1(\widetilde{\mu}) = \mu$, where π_1 is the projection to the 1th coordinate. Obviously,

$$P_{\widetilde{\mu}}(\widetilde{T},f\circ\pi_1) = h_{\widetilde{\mu}}(\widetilde{T}) + \int_{\widetilde{X}} f\circ\pi_1 d\widetilde{\mu} \geq h_\mu(T) + \int_X f d\mu = P(T,f).$$

By Theorem 4.6, there exists a Borel set $\widetilde{X_0} \subseteq \overline{\widetilde{X} \text{ with } \widetilde{\mu}}(\widetilde{X_0}) = 1$ such that for each $\widetilde{x} \in \widetilde{X_0}$, there exists a closed subset $E(\widetilde{x}) \subseteq W^s(\widetilde{x}, \widetilde{T})$ such that

$$P(\widetilde{T}, f \circ \pi_1, E(\widetilde{x})) \geq P_{\widetilde{\mu}}(\widetilde{T}, f \circ \pi_1) \quad \text{and } E(\widetilde{x}) \in WM_s(\widetilde{X}, \widetilde{T}).$$

Let $(X_0) = \pi_1(\widetilde{X_0})$. Then $X_0 \in \mathcal{B}_\mu$ and $\mu(X_0) = 1$. For each $x \in X_0$ let $E(x) = \pi_1(E(\widetilde{x}))$, where $x = \pi_1(\widetilde{x})$. Then $E(x) \subseteq \pi_1(\overline{W^s(\widetilde{x}, \widetilde{T})}) \subseteq \overline{W^s(x, T)}$. By Lemma 5.5, we have

$$P(T, f, E(x)) = P(\widetilde{T}, f\circ, E(\widetilde{x})) \geq P_{\widetilde{\mu}}(\widetilde{T}, f \circ \pi_1) \geq P_\mu(T, f)$$

and $E(x) \in WM_s(X, T)$. □

The following result is immediate.

Corollary 4. *Let (X, T) be a non-invertible TDS. Then*

(a). $\sup_{x \in X} P(T, f, \overline{W^s(x, T)}) = P(T, f)$;

(b). If there exists $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ with $P_\mu(T, f) = P(T, f)$, then for μ-a.e. $x \in X$, there exists a closed subsets $E(x) \subseteq \overline{W^s(x, T)}$ such that $E(x) \in WM_s(X, T)$ and $P(T, f, E(x)) = P(T, f)$.

Remark 2. In fact, from the proof of Theorem 4.4, we know $E(x) = supp(\mu_x)$, where μ_x is a probability measure determined by the disintegration of $\mu \in \mathcal{M}^e(X, T)$ over the Pinsker σ-algebra $P_\mu(T)$.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Fiebig, U.R. Fiebig, Z.H. Nitecki, *Entropy and preimage sets*, Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys., **23** (2003), 1785–1806.

[2] F. Blanchard, B. Host, S. Ruette, *Asymptotic pairs in positive-entropy systems*, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys., **22** (2002), 671–686.

[3] F. Blanchard, W. Huang, *Entropy sets, weakly mixing sets and entropy capacity*, Discrete and Continuous Dynamicl Systems, **20**(2) (2008), 275–311.

[4] J. Xiong, Z. Yang, Chaos caused by a topologically mixing map.*In: Dynamical systems and related topics, (Nagoya, 1990)* Advanced Series in Dynamical Systems **9**, River Edge, NJ: World Scientific (1990). PP.550–572.

[5] N. Sumi, *Diffeomorphisms with positive entropy and chaos in the sense of Li-Yorke* , Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys., **23**(2) (2003), 621–635.

[6] P. Romagnoli, *A local variational principle for the topological entropy*, Ergod. Th. Dynam. Sys., **23** (2003), 1601–1610.

[7] P. Walters, "An Introduction to Ergodic Thoery", Springer-Verlag, New York, 1982.

[8] W. Huang, *Stable sets and ϵ-stable sets in positive-entropy systems*, Commun. Math. Phys., **279** (2008), 535–557.

[9] W. Huang, Y. Yi, *A local variational principle for pressure and its applications to equilibrium states*, Israel Journal of Mathematics, **161** (2007), 29–74.

[10] X. Ma, E. Chen and A. Zhang, *A relative local variational principle for topological pressure*, SCIENCE CHINA Mathematics, **53**(6) (2010), 1491–1506.

E-mail address: `xianfengma@gmail.com`
E-mail address: `ecchen@njnu.edu.cn`